



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Cal*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,369	07/06/2001	Alan Weir Bucher	PU010126	6022

7590 06/06/2005  
THOMSON multimedia Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
Two Independence Way  
Post Office Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08540-5312

EXAMINER

LEURIG, SHARLENE L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/900,369	BUCHER, ALAN WEIR	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sharlene Leurig	2879	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on March 18, 2005 has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amended claim recites "detensioning members fixed along the peripheral surfaces of said sides". It is unclear which peripheral surfaces of the sides have detensioning members affixed to them; the claim as it now stands lends itself to the interpretation that all the peripheral surfaces have detensioning members affixed to them. The applicant does not provide interpretive guidance in the remarks accompanying the amendment. Because the examiner noted that a claim reciting detensioning members fixed along both the inner and outer surfaces of the short sides and the inner and outer surfaces of the long sides would raise a possible 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph problem of lack of adequate written description, the claim will be interpreted as meaning that detensioning members are fixed to some, but not all, of the peripheral surfaces of the frame sides.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kume et al. (5,111,107) (of record).

Regarding claim 1, Kume discloses a tension mask frame assembly for a CRT comprising a substantially rectangular mask support frame having a first coefficient of thermal expansion and including a central major axis and a central minor axis perpendicular to each other, the frame having a pair of opposing long sides (Figure 1, elements 1 and 2) extending in parallel to the major axis and a pair of opposing short sides (3 and 4) extending in parallel to the minor axis. Each side has an outer peripheral surface and an inner peripheral surface. A tension mask (6) is supported between a pair of support blade members, the upper leg of the L-shaped long members (Figure 2, element 5a), which are attached to the frame at a point along a respective one of the pair of opposing long sides. A detensioning member (9) is fixed along the outer peripheral surfaces of the pair of opposing short sides, and has a second coefficient of thermal expansion whereby the attachment points are drawn toward each other during thermal cycling of the assembly, as illustrated in Figure 2 (column 3, lines 13-23).

Regarding claim 3, Kume discloses that the second coefficient of thermal expansion is greater than the first coefficient of thermal expansion of the frame,

Art Unit: 2879

including the inner surface of the long sides and the outer surface of the short sides (column 2, lines 65-68).

Regarding claim 6, the opposing long and short sides lie in a frame plane, specifically the plane that encompasses the area where the long and short sides meet.

Regarding claim 7, the peripheral surface along which the detensioning member (9) is fixed lies generally orthogonal to the frame plane.

Regarding claim 8, a pair of support blade members (Figure 2, element 5a) has at least one generally central attachment point for attaching each of the support blade members to a pair of opposing sides of the frame.

6. Claims 1, 2 and 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ragland, Jr. (5,932,957) (of record).

Regarding claim 1, Ragland discloses a tension mask frame assembly for a CRT comprising a substantially rectangular mask support frame having a first coefficient of thermal expansion and including a central major axis and a central minor axis perpendicular to each other, the frame having a pair of opposing long sides (Figure 3, element 50) extending in parallel to the major axis and a pair of opposing short sides (40) extending in parallel to the minor axis. Each side has an outer peripheral surface and an inner peripheral surface. A tension mask (24) is supported between a pair of support blade members (52) attached to the frame at a point along a respective one of the pair of opposing long sides. A detensioning member (60) is fixed along one of the outer or inner peripheral surfaces of at least one of the sides, where "along" is

Art Unit: 2879

interpreted as "in line with a length or direction", and has a second coefficient of thermal expansion whereby the attachment points are drawn toward each other during thermal cycling of the assembly, as illustrated in Figure 3.

Regarding claim 2, the detensioning member has a lower thermal coefficient of expansion than the frame, including the outer surface of the long side and the inner surface of the short sides.

Regarding claim 6, the opposing long and short sides lie in a frame plane, specifically the plane that encompasses the area where the long and short sides meet.

Regarding claim 7, the peripheral surface along which the detensioning member (60) is fixed lies generally orthogonal to the frame plane.

Regarding claim 8, a pair of support blade members (Figure 3, element 52) having at least one generally central attachment point for attaching each of the support blade members to a pair of opposing sides of the frame.

Regarding claim 9, Ragland discloses a cathode ray tube comprising a glass envelope having a rectangular facepanel (Figure 1, element 18) and a tubular neck (14) extending from the panel through a funnel (15), a phosphor screen (22) carried by an inner surface of the faceplate panel, an electron gun (26) centrally mounted within the neck, and a tension mask frame assembly (35) mounted between the electron gun and the panel. The mask frame assembly has the limitations described above with respect to claim 1, including a tension mask supported on a frame between a pair of mounting locations and a detensioning member fixed along at least one side of the frame, and having a coefficient of thermal expansion whereby the mounting locations are drawn

Art Unit: 2879

toward each other during thermal cycling of the mask frame assembly, as shown in Figure 3.

Regarding claim 10, a pair of support blade members (Figure 3, element 52) are mounted to the tension mask frame assembly at the mounting locations.

Regarding claim 11, the tension mask (24) is attached to the support blade members (52).

Regarding claim 12, the long and short sides lie in a common plane, specifically the plane that encompasses the area where the long and short sides meet.

Regarding claim 13, the detensioning member (60) is fixed along a peripheral surface of one of the sides that is generally orthogonal to the frame plane.

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Der Wilk (6,686,684) (of record).

Regarding claim 4, Van Der Wilk discloses a cathode ray tube having a tension mask and frame assembly comprising a mask mounted in tension on a substantially rectangular frame, the frame having a first coefficient of thermal expansion and

Art Unit: 2879

including a pair of opposing long sides (Figures 4 and 5, element 14) and short sides (9C and 9D) disposed at generally a right angle with respect to the long sides with each of the sides connected to form a continuous generally planar frame having an inner and outer peripheral surface, since "planar" means "involving two dimensions", "being made of flat planes", or "lying in a plane". The frame disclosed by Van Der Wilk can be considered planar, as it is composed of constituents that lie in a plane together in the areas where the long and short sides join, and furthermore is composed of constituents that are made of flat planes. Detensioning members (11, 16) having a second coefficient of thermal expansion that is greater than the first coefficient of thermal expansion are fixed along the outer surface of said short sides and inner surface of said long sides (column 5, lines 19-44).

Regarding claim 5, the frame includes a pair of support blade members (24), each having at least one generally central attachment point for attaching each of the blade members to a pair of opposing sides of the frame.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kume et al. (5,111,107) (of record)) in view of Ragland, Jr. (5,932,957) (of record).



Kume discloses a tension mask frame assembly for a CRT comprising a substantially rectangular mask support frame having a first coefficient of thermal expansion and including a central major axis and a central minor axis perpendicular to each other, the frame having a pair of opposing long sides (Figure 1, elements 1 and 2) extending in parallel to the major axis and a pair of opposing short sides (3 and 4) extending in parallel to the minor axis to form a planar rectangular mask support frame. The sides are connected to form a continuous generally planar frame having an inner and outer peripheral surface, since "planar" means "involving two dimensions", "being made of flat planes", or "lying in a plane". The frame disclosed by Kume can be considered planar, as it is composed of constituents that lie in a plane together in the areas where the long and short sides join, and furthermore is composed of constituents that are made of flat planes. A tension mask (6) is supported on the frame between a pair of mounting locations on the upper leg of the L-shaped long members (Figure 2, element 5a), each being located on one of the pair of opposing sides. A detensioning member (9) is fixed along a peripheral surface of at least one of the sides, and has a coefficient of thermal expansion different from the coefficient of thermal expansion of the frame whereby the mounting locations are drawn toward each other during thermal cycling of the assembly, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Kume fails to disclose the other components of the CRT in which the frame assembly is disposed.

Ragland teaches a cathode ray tube having a tension mask frame assembly comprising a mask mounted in tension on a substantially rectangular frame, the cathode

Art Unit: 2879

ray tube further comprising a glass envelope having a rectangular facepanel (Figure 1, element 18) and a tubular neck (14) extending from the panel through a funnel (15), a phosphor screen (22) carried by an inner surface of the faceplate panel, and an electron gun (26) centrally mounted within the neck.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cathode ray tube of Kume to have the additional components taught by Ragland in order to provide a surface on which the generated image of the CRT is projected and an electron gun assembly to form the image.

Regarding claim 10, Kume discloses a pair of support blade members, the upper leg of the L-shaped long members (Figure 2, element 5a), mounted to the tension mask frame at the mounting locations.

Regarding claim 11, Kume discloses the tension mask fixed to the support blade members.

Regarding claim 12, Kume discloses the opposing long and short sides lying in a common plane, specifically the plane that encompasses the area where the long and short sides meet.

Regarding claim 13, Kume discloses a detensioning member (9) fixed along a peripheral surface of one of the sides which is generally orthogonal to the common plane.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed March 18, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that the indefiniteness rejection of claim 4 has been overcome by the amendment. While some of the indefiniteness has been rectified, the limitation of the detensioning members being fixed to "the peripheral surfaces of said sides" is indefinite for the reasons given above.

Regarding claims 1, 3 and 6-8, applicant has argued that the claims are allowable over the Kume reference, as Kume allegedly teaches "a grid apparatus for a color cathode ray tube" having "a frame 5 with support members 3, 4" (page 7) and metallic members "attached to the underside of support members" having "a higher coefficient of thermal expansion than that of the support members" (page 8). Applicant does not provide specific arguments as to what claimed structure the Kume reference lacks, but merely recites the entire claim as being that which the Kume reference fails to disclose. The examiner disagrees and directs the applicant to the rejection above, which dissects the claim and directs the applicant to the areas of the reference which disclose the claimed structure.

Regarding claims 1, 2 and 6-13, applicant has argued that the claims are allowable over the Ragland reference, as Ragland allegedly teaches "a detensioning rod assembly 60 for a color cathode ray tube" having a detensioning rod "attached to and between legs 62, 64 of U-shaped frame members 40,42" (page 10). Applicant does not provide specific arguments as to what claimed structure the Ragland reference

Art Unit: 2879

lacks, but merely recites the entire claim as being that which the Ragland reference fails to disclose. The examiner disagrees and directs the applicant to the rejection above, which dissects the claim and directs the applicant to the areas of the reference which disclose the claimed structure.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, applicant has argued that the claims are allowable over the Van Der Wilk reference, as Van Der Wilk allegedly teaches "a tension mask and frame" having a "mask frame 9 positioned on metal strips 11, 12" having "different coefficients of thermal expansion" (page 12). Applicant does not provide specific arguments as to what claimed structure the Van Der Wilk reference lacks, but merely recites the entire claim as being that which the Van Der Wilk reference fails to disclose. The examiner disagrees and directs the applicant to the rejection above, which dissects the claim and directs the applicant to the areas of the reference which disclose the claimed structure.

Regarding claims 9-13, the applicant has argued that the claim is not obvious over the combination of the Kume and Ragland references. Again, the applicant does not provide specific arguments as to what claimed structure the references lack, but merely recites the entire claim as being that which they fail to teach. The examiner disagrees and directs the applicant to the rejection above, which dissects the claim and directs the applicant to the areas of the reference which disclose the claimed structure.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharlene Leurig whose telephone number is (571) 272-2455. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sll

82

  
NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800